



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,776	07/08/2005	Toshihiko Ohashi	0216-0516PUS1	1474
2292	7590	04/24/2008	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			CHANG, VICTOR S	
PO BOX 747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			1794	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
04/24/2008	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/541,776	OHASHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Victor S. Chang	1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3 and 5-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3,5,14 and 15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1. Applicants' declaration, amendments and remarks filed on 2/27/2008 have been entered. Claims 1, 14 and 15 have been amended. Claim 2 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 5, 14 and 15 are active.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. In response to the amendments, the grounds of rejection have been updated as set forth below. Rejections not maintained are withdrawn.

Rejections Based on Prior Art

4. Claims 1, 3, 5, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lange et al. [US 4816333] in view of Takahashi et al. [US 6251523].
Lange's invention [col. 2, lines 36-42; col. 3, lines 7-10; col. 4, lines 11-55; Examples 1 and 13] relates to an antireflective polymeric or glass substrate having a porous silica coating thereon. The porous coating comprises a continuous gelled network of voids between the silica particles. The gelled network is formed from a colloidal solution of silica particles. When dried, the silica coating has an open porosity of about 25 to 70 percent, and has a refractive index between 1.20-1.30. The average primary particle size of the colloidal silica particles is less than 200 Å (20 nm), preferably less than about 70 Å to achieve good adhesion (abrasion resistant) of

the coating to the substrate and antireflection properties. Fig. 2 illustrates the antireflective property of a silica coated polyethylene terephthalate (PET) film.

For claims 1 and 3, Lange lacks a teaching of making an antireflection coating from a colloidal solution comprising chain silica fine particles (moniliform silica strings). However, Takahashi's invention relates to a coating on glass windows having small reflectivity (antireflection) at high incident angle for an improved visibility. The coating is formed from a colloidal solution comprising chain silica fine particles and silica (colloidal forming hydrolysable silane) of 5 to 30% by weight based on the weight of said chain silica fine particles [col. 1, ll. 55-61]. Space (void or pore) is formed between the mutually adjacent chain silica fine particles in the coating. The coating has refractive index of 1.25 to 1.40. Dents and projections caused by the chain silica fine particles are formed on the surface of the coating [col. 1, ll. 66 through col. 2, ll. 8]. A large number of gaps of 5 to 20 nm width are formed between the adjacent chain fine particles in the coating. These large numbers of gaps have exceedingly large gross volume in comparison with the gaps made on supposition of using the same amount of spherical silica fine particles in place of the chain silica fine particles. The low refractive index of the coating approaches the theoretical value (1.225) required for obtaining zero reflectance for glass substrate [col. 2, ll. 20-37]. The void volume (porosity) of the coating is between 50 to 80% [col. 2, ll. 48]. The size of the chain silica fine (primary) particles is preferably of an average diameter of 10 to 20 nm and an average length of 60 to 200 nm. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute Lange's antireflection coating with Takahashi's coating, because the selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use supported a *prima facie* obviousness determination. See MPEP § 2144.07. Alternatively, since

Takahashi suggests that the coating approaches zero reflectance, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lange's coating with Takahashi's chain silica fine particles, motivated by the desire to obtain a coating with improved low reflectance (i.e., improved antireflection). Regarding the hardness, minimum reflectance and the equation describing the structural relationship between various structural elements of the coating, since the collective teachings of prior art render the structure and composition of the claimed invention obvious, these properties are deemed to be obvious routine optimization to one skilled in the art.

For claim 5, since Lange teaches the same PET substrate for the same use as the instant invention, the hardness of the substrate is deemed to be inherent to the PET film.

For claims 14 and 15, since they claim essentially the same scope as claims 1 and 3, they are also rejected for the same reasons as set forth above. Regarding newly added product-by-process limitations, since they have not been shown on the record to produce a patentably distinct article, the formed articles are rendered *prima facie* obvious, and the process limitations at the present time have not been given patentable weight.

Response to Argument

5. Since collective teachings of prior art render the structure and composition of the antireflection coating obvious, as set forth above, applicants arguments directed to Lange individually are moot.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor S. Chang whose telephone number is 571-272-1474. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 am - 5:00 pm, Tuesday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on 571-272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Victor S Chang/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794